

Any



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,154	12/19/2003	David S. Benco	LUC-459/Benco 56-7	6000
32205	7590	10/05/2005	EXAMINER	
PATTI & BRILL ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET 44TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60602			HANNIF ALI, LARRY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/742,154	Applicant(s) BENCO ET AL.	
	Examiner Larry Hannif-Ali	Art Unit 2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12-19-03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action: (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1 and 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2) in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1).

Regarding **Claim 1**, Bakke teaches a system for interfacing a data capable mobile phone to peripheral devices [Col 6, lines 20-22 & Col 6, lines 52-55 & Col 8, lines 19-30 (the computer system in one embodiment could be a mobile device including smartphones)], comprising: an internal bus in the mobile phone [Col 6, lines 23-26]; a peripheral hub operatively connected to the internal bus [Col 6, lines 61-63 & Fig 1 Items 115 and 130]; and the peripheral hub respectively functionally coupling the peripheral devices to the mobile phone [Col 6, lines 61-63]; the peripheral hub having I/O ports ; a plurality of peripheral devices operatively connected to the I/O ports of the peripheral hub [Col 6, lines 64-66 & Fig. 1 Items 130, 132, 134, and 136 (it is inherent that the hub will incorporate I/O ports)]. However, Bakke fails to specifically teach device controllers in the peripheral hub for respectively the I/O ports. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitations were well known in the art as taught by Leete.

Art Unit: 2684

In the same field of endeavor, Leete discloses a power hub [paragraph 0014] including; device controllers in the peripheral hub for respectively the I/O ports [paragraph 0030, lines 1-2 & paragraph 0032, lines 5-10 & Fig. 5 Item 540];

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the power hub as taught by Leete together with the system of Bakke in order to have a system with device controllers for the I/O ports.

Regarding **Claim 5**. The combination of Bakke and Leete further teaches wherein the a plurality of peripheral devices are operatively connected to the peripheral hub, and wherein a respective peripheral device of the plurality of peripheral devices is one of: mouse, trackball, monitor, keyboard, printer, scanner, digital camera, storage device, digital video camera, joystick, speaker, audio system, video display device, and microphone [Bakke: Col 6, lines 64-66].

3. **Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2) in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1), and further in view of Yen (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0198429 A1).

Regarding **Claim 2**. Bakke teaches an input operatively connectable to the internal bus of the mobile phone [Col 9, lines 21-25 & Fig 2]; and at least one peripheral device output that is an I/O port [Col 6, lines 64-66 & Fig. 1 Items 130, 132, 134, and 136]. However, Bakke fails to specifically teach device controllers for the I/O ports operatively connected to the input and to the at least one output. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Leete.

In the same field of endeavor, Leete discloses a power supply with bus hub having device controllers for the I/O ports operatively connected to the input and to the at least one output [paragraph 0032, lines 5-10 & Fig. 4].

Art Unit: 2684

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the power hub as taught by Leete together with the system of Bakke in order to have a system with device controllers for the I/O ports.

The combination of Bakke and Leete fails to specifically teach the use of a functionality module, the functionality module separating peripheral interfaces from the internal bus of the mobile phone and making respective peripheral interfaces available on respective outputs of the peripheral hub. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Yen.

In the same field of endeavor, Yen discloses a hub provided with the function of wireless communication [paragraph 0010] a functionality module having I/O interface, the functionality module separating peripheral interfaces from the internal bus of the mobile phone and making respective peripheral interfaces available on respective outputs of the peripheral hub [paragraph 0016, lines 1-8 & Fig 2 (hub control module)].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub control module as taught by Yen together with the system of Bakke and Leete, in order to have a hub control module for controlling the device controllers for respectively the I/O ports.

Regarding **Claim 4**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, and Yen further teaches wherein the functionality module further comprises functionality to recognize peripheral devices connected to the peripheral hub [Yen: paragraph 0016, lines 3-7 & Leete: paragraph 0032, lines 5-8 (the hub control module controls the device controllers which detects the peripheral devices)].

Regarding **Claim 6**. Bakke teaches a peripheral hub for interfacing a data capable mobile phone to at least one peripheral device [Col 6, lines 20-22 & Col 6, lines 52-55 & Col 6, lines 61-63 & Col 8, lines 19-30 (the computer system in one embodiment could be a mobile device including smartphones)], comprising:

Art Unit: 2684

an input that is an I/O port operatively connectable to an internal bus of the mobile phone [Col 6, lines 61-63 & Fig 1 (it is inherent that the hub will incorporate I/O ports)]; at least one peripheral device output that is an I/O port [Fig 1 Items 130, 132, 134, and 136 (it is inherent that the hub will incorporate I/O ports)]. However, Bakke fails to specifically teach device controllers in the peripheral hub for respectively the I/O ports. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitations were well known in the art as taught by Leete.

In the same field of endeavor, Leete discloses a power hub [paragraph 0014] including; device controllers in the peripheral hub for respectively the I/O ports [paragraph 0030, lines 1-2 & paragraph 0032, lines 5-10 & Fig. 5 Item 540];

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the power hub as taught by Leete together with the system of Bakke in order to have a system with device controllers for the I/O ports.

The combination of Bakke and Leete fails to specifically teach a functionality module having device controllers operatively connected to the input and to the at least one peripheral device output, wherein the functionality module separates at least one peripheral interface from the internal bus of the mobile phone and makes the at least one peripheral interface available on the at least one output. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Yen.

In the same field of endeavor, Yen discloses a hub provided with the function of wireless communication [paragraph 0010] a functionality module having I/O interface, the functionality module separating peripheral interfaces from the internal bus of the mobile phone and making respective peripheral interfaces available on respective outputs of the peripheral hub [paragraph 0016, lines 1-8 & Fig 2 (hub control module)].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub control module as taught by Yen

Art Unit: 2684

together with the system of Bakke and Leete, in order to have a hub control module for controlling the device controllers for respectively the I/O ports.

Regarding **Claim 8**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, and Yen further teaches wherein the functionality module further comprises functionality to recognize peripheral devices connected to the peripheral hub [Yen: paragraph 0016, lines 3-7 & Leete: paragraph 0032, lines 5-8 (the hub control module controls the device controllers which detects the peripheral devices)].

4. **Claims 3 and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2), in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1), in view of Yen (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0198429 A1) and further in view of Laity (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0135681 A1).

Regarding **Claim 3**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, and Yen teaches everything as applied above in Claim 2. However, the combination fails to specifically teach the peripheral hub has a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Laity.

In the same field of endeavor, Laity discloses a computer port expansion system including a peripheral hub having a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector [paragraph 0043, lines 1-11]

Art Unit: 2684

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub module with the USB-Type B connectors as taught by Laity together with the system of Bakke, Leete, and Yen in order to have at least one output for use with smaller peripherals e.g. digital cameras, PDAs and handheld devices.

Regarding **Claim 7**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, and Yen teaches everything as applied above in Claim 6. However, the combination fails to specifically teach the peripheral hub has a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Laity.

In the same field of endeavor, Laity discloses a computer port expansion system including a peripheral hub having a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector [paragraph 0043, lines 1-11]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub module with the USB-Type B connectors as taught by Laity together with the system of Bakke, Leete, and Yen in order to have at least one output for use with smaller peripherals e.g. digital cameras, PDAs and handheld devices.

5. **Claims 9, 11, and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2) in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1), in view of Yen (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0198429 A1) and further in view of Croyle (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0133722 A1)

Regarding **Claim 9**, Bakke teaches a system for interfacing a data capable mobile phone to at least one peripheral device [Col 6, lines 20-22 & Col 6, lines 52-55 & Col 8, lines 19-30 (the computer system in one embodiment could be a mobile device including smartphones)], comprising; an internal bus in the mobile phone [Col 6, lines 23-26]; and a peripheral hub having an input that is an I/O port and at least one output that is an I/O port [Col 6, lines 61-63 & Fig 1 Items 115, 130, 132, 134, and 136 (it is inherent that the hub will incorporate I/O ports)]. Bakke also teaches at least one peripheral device releasably connectable to the at least one output of the peripheral hub [Col 6, lines 61-63 & Fig 1 Items 132, 134, and 136]. However, Bakke fails to specifically teach a bus connector on the mobile phone, the bus connector operatively connected to the internal bus; and an interface cable having a first end releasably connectable to the bus connector and a second end operatively connected to the input of the peripheral hub. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Croyle.

In the same field of endeavor, Croyle discloses a communication interface for an electronic device including a bus connector on the mobile phone, the bus connector operatively connected to the internal bus; and an interface cable having a first end releasably connectable to the bus connector and a second end operatively connected to the input of the peripheral hub [paragraph 0030, lines 1-5 & paragraph 0049, lines 1-5 & Fig 6].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the communication interface of Croyle together with the system of Bakke in order to have connectors that are releasably connected.

The combination of Bakke and Croyle fails to specifically teach device controllers separating at least one peripheral interface from the internal bus of the mobile phone and making the at least one peripheral interface available on

Art Unit: 2684

the at least one output. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Leete.

In the same field of endeavor, Leete discloses a power hub [paragraph 0014] including; device controllers in the peripheral hub device, the device controllers separating at least one peripheral interface from the internal bus of the mobile phone and making the at least one peripheral interface available on the at least one output [paragraph 0030, lines 1-2 & paragraph 0032, lines 5-10 & Fig. 5 Item 540].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the power hub of Leete together with the system of Bakke and Croyle in order to have a system with device controllers for the I/O ports.

The combination of Bakke, Croyle, and Leete fails to specifically teach a functionality module operatively connected to the input and to the at least one output. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Yen.

In the same field of endeavor, Yen discloses a hub provided with the function of wireless communication [paragraph 0010] a functionality module operatively connected to the input and to the at least one output [paragraph 0016, lines 1-8 & Fig 2 (hub control module)].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub control module as taught by Yen together with the system of Bakke, Croyle, and Leete, in order to have a hub control module for controlling the device controllers for respectively the I/O ports.

Regarding **Claim 11**. The combination of Bakke, Croyle, Leete, and Yen further teaches wherein the functionality module further comprises functionality to recognize peripheral devices connected to the peripheral hub [Yen: paragraph 0016, lines 3-7 & Leete: paragraph 0032, lines 5-8 (the hub control module controls the device controllers which detects the peripheral devices)].

Regarding **Claim 12**. The combination of Bakke, Croyle, Leete, and Yen further teaches wherein a plurality of peripheral devices are operatively connected to the peripheral hub, and wherein a respective peripheral device of the plurality of peripheral devices is one of: mouse, trackball, monitor, keyboard, printer, scanner, digital camera, storage device, digital video camera, joystick, speaker, audio system, video display device, and microphone [Bakke: Col 6, lines 64-66].

6. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2), in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1), in view of Croyle (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0133722 A1), in view of Yen (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0198429 A1) and further in view of Laity (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0135681 A1).

Regarding **Claim 10**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, Croyle, and Yen teaches everything as applied above in Claim 9. However, the combination fails to specifically teach the peripheral hub has a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Laity.

In the same field of endeavor, Laity discloses a computer port expansion system including a peripheral hub having a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector [paragraph 0043, lines 1-11]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub module with the USB-Type B

Art Unit: 2684

connectors as taught by Laity together with the system of Bakke, Leete, Croyle and Yen in order to have at least one output for use with smaller peripherals e.g. digital cameras, PDAs and handheld devices.

7. **Claims 13, 15 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2) in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1) and further in view of Lee (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0015536 A1).

Regarding **Claim 13**. Bakke teaches a method for interfacing a data capable mobile phone to at least one peripheral device [Col 6, lines 20-22 & Col 6, lines 52-55 & Col 8, lines 19-30 (the computer system in one embodiment could be a mobile device including smartphones)], comprising: providing an internal bus in the mobile phone [Col 6, lines 23-26]; providing a peripheral hub having an input that is an I/O port and at least one output that is an I/O port [Col 6, lines 61-63 & Fig 1 Items 115, 130, 132, 134, and 136 (it is inherent that the hub will incorporate I/O ports)]; operatively connecting the internal bus to the input of the peripheral hub [Col 6, lines 61-63 & Fig 1 Items 115 and 130 (it is inherent that the hub will incorporate I/O ports)]; operatively connecting at least one peripheral device to the at least one output of the peripheral hub [Col 6, lines 61-63 and lines 64-66 & Fig 1 Items 132, 134, and 136]. Bakke further teaches the internal bus of the mobile phone exchanges data and control information with a CPU of the mobile phone [Col 6, lines 52-55]. However, Bakke fails to specifically teach providing an I/O interface device controller respectively for each I/O port in the peripheral hub and directing control and data from the internal bus of the mobile phone to a corresponding interface device controller for a respective peripheral device. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Leete.

In the same field of endeavor, Leete discloses a power hub [paragraph 0014] including; directing control and data from the internal bus of the mobile

Art Unit: 2684

phone to a corresponding interface device controller for a respective peripheral device [paragraph 0030, lines 1-2 & paragraph 0032, lines 5-10 & Fig. 5 Item 540];

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the power hub as taught by Leete together with the system of Bakke in order to have a system with device controllers for the I/O ports.

The combination of Bakke and Leete fails to specifically teach; storing and installing drivers for peripheral devices connected to the peripheral hub. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Lee.

In the same field of endeavor, Lee discloses a peripheral device having a personal disk for storing drivers for an external device host [paragraph 0009 & paragraph 0029, lines 1-15 & paragraph 0030, lines 1-5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the peripheral device of Lee together with the combination of Bakke and Leete in order to have a system capable of storing and installing device drivers.

Regarding **Claim 15**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, and Lee further teaches where the method further comprises recognizing peripheral devices connected to the hub [Leete: paragraph 0032, lines 5-8].

Regarding **Claim 16**. The combination of Bakke, Leete, and Lee further teaches wherein the a plurality of peripheral devices are operatively connected to the peripheral hub, and wherein a respective peripheral device of the plurality of peripheral devices is one of: mouse, trackball, monitor, keyboard, printer, scanner, digital camera, storage device, digital video camera, joystick, speaker, audio system, video display device, and microphone [Bakke: Col 6, lines 64-66].

Art Unit: 2684

8. **Claim 14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakke (U.S. Patent No. 6704812 B2), in view of Leete (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225804 A1), in view of Lee (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0015536 A1) and further in view of Laity (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0135681 A1).

Regarding **Claim 14**. The combination of Bakke, Leete and Lee teaches everything as applied above in Claim 13. However, the combination fails to specifically teach the peripheral hub has a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector. The examiner maintains that the claimed limitation was well known in the art as taught by Laity.

In the same field of endeavor, Laity discloses a computer port expansion system including a peripheral hub having a plurality of peripheral device outputs, and wherein a respective peripheral device output of the plurality of peripheral device outputs is one of; DB25 parallel port connector, HD15 connector, six pin mini DIN (PS/2) connector, IEEE 1394 six pin connector, IEEE 1394 four pin connector, USB-A connector, and USB-B connector [paragraph 0043, lines 1-11]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use, the hub module with the USB-Type B connectors as taught by Laity together with the system of Bakke, Leete, and Lee in order to have at least one output for use with smaller peripherals e.g. digital cameras, PDAs and handheld devices.

Art Unit: 2684

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry Hannif-Ali whose telephone number is 571-272-5598. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Larry Hannif-Ali

September 16, 2005



NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER